

**REMARKS**

Claims 1- 30 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 24-30 have been withdrawn by the Examiner.

**I. Restriction of Claims on Formal Matters**

The Examiner rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has herein rewritten claim 23 in independent form to address the Examiner's concern. Applicant thus respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 23.

**II. Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. § 102**

*A. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8 and 23*

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Bailey (4,434,637). Applicant traverses.

The following remarks are for independent claim 1, but equally apply to independent claim 23.

Claim 1 requires: "a portion of each of the first projections that is first brought into contact with the plate member is entirely made flat." Bailey fails to teach or suggest these features.

The Examiner seems to allege that Fig. 3 of Bailey shows a cross section viewed from the second direction and that Fig. 4 shows a cross section viewed from the first direction. As shown in Fig. 4, the die 36 has a projection 100. Since the projection 100 that contacts the plate member is not entirely made flat, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable.

Therefore, Bailey fails to anticipate the subject matter of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 3, 5, 6, and 8, as well as independent claim 23.

B. Claims 1 and 7

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Bion (3,665,745).

In Bion, Fig. 3 shows a roller 12 having a rounded tip. Bion cannot teach or suggest “a portion of each of the first projections that is first brought into contact with the plate member is entirely made flat”.

Therefore, Bion does not anticipate the subject matter of claim 1, and accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of independent claim 1 and its dependent claim 7.

**III. Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner rejected claims 9-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bion (3,665,745).

Since claim 1 is patentable over Bion, and since claims 9-17 depend on claim 1, claims 9-17 are patentable by virtue of their dependency. Applicant thus respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of dependent claims 9-17, too.

**IV. Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner objected to claims 2, 4, and 18-22 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would allow them in if rewritten in independent form.

Applicant has traversed the rejection of the base claim 1 and respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this objection to claims 2, 4, and 18-22, by allowing them in their present form.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No. 10/644,091

Attorney Docket No. Q77088

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Kelly G. Hyndman  
Registration No. 39,234

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 5, 2005